

AUG 23 2007

SCOTT & YALLERY-ARTHUR  
7306 Georgia Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20012  
(202) 882-5770

Date August 23, 2007 Page 1 of 7SEND TO: NAME: R. ChinFIRM: U. S. Patents and Trademark OfficeFAX: (571) 273-2300 PHONE: (703) 308-1613SENT BY: NAME: Nigel L. Scott, Esquire

S&amp;Y-A FAX: (202) 722-0040

SUBJECT: Amendment to Application No.09/912,692COMMENTS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ORIGINAL WILL: \_\_\_\_\_ Follow Via Mail  
\_\_\_\_\_ Follow Via Messenger  
\_\_\_\_\_ Follow Via Overnight

This fax is intended for the exclusive use of the addressee named above, and may contain legally privileged and confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient of this fax, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this fax is strictly prohibited.

If you received this fax in error, please notify us immediately by telephone and return the original fax to us at the above address via the United States Postal Service. We will reimburse any costs you incur in notifying us and returning the fax to us.

**AUG 23 2007****IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE****In re: Patent Application of Edward T. Buford, III****Serial No: 09/912,692****Group Art Unit:****Filed: 7/26/2001****Examiner: R. Chin****Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks  
Washington, D.C. 20321****Sir:****RESPONSE TO OFFICE ACTION MAILED MAY 24, 2007**

This is in response to the Office Action mailed, May 24, 2007, in respect of the above-identified patent application.

For the record, applicant hereby registers his disappointment at the Examiner's reversal of his allowance of the claims presented. It should also be noted that this is not the first time that the Examiner has seemingly reversed course after indicating that the claims presented for examination were allowable then altering his stance. Additionally, while the Examiner suggests that their allowable subject matter if the claims were presented with a spiral groove, it must be noted that the Examiner has rejected claims employing a spiral groove. Nevertheless, applicant will amend the claims along the lines suggested by the Examiner.

In the subject Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 17 and 19 for obviousness based upon 35 U. S. C. 103 (a). Specifically, the rejection was based upon the assertion that referenced claims were unpatentable over Stewart 2,876,477 on the grounds that Stewart teaches a brush having a groove or flute along its longitudinal axis, thus it is demonstrably similar to the grooved bristle described by applicant in his invention. The Examiner supports his rejection by reference to Figs. 3,

4, 5, 6 and 7 of Stewart.

Applicant begs to differ. The Examiner's rationale for the rejection is that the physical characteristics of Stewart are the functional equivalent of applicant's grooved bristle. Stewart does not make any reference in his specification or claims to the method or results achieved from the structural elements of the invention. Essentially, Stewart demonstrates a technique for efficient placement of the bristles in "tuft-receiving holes" such that the apices of the cross-section of the bristles are adjacent to each. The effect, if any, that such a placement will have on cleaning, particularly the ability of the apices of the bristles to act as cleaning devices is not mentioned.

Morcover, the arrangement of the bristles as described by Stewart virtually precludes the apices from having any cleaning function since the apices are adjacent to each other and not exposed. Further, unlike the bristle of applicant's invention that has a single groove along the longitudinal axis and is designed so that the entire length of the bristle is a cleaning device, the polygonal shape of Stewart's bristles does not lend itself to a cleansing function. Consequently, applicant asserts that the differences between the Stewart bristle and the bristle of the invention are not merely functional.

Accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsiders and reexamines claims 17 and 19 as amended. However, in an effort to overcome the Examiner's rejection of the claims, applicant has amended the claims as suggested.

Applicant hereby submits new claims 20 and 21 for examination. The new claims are specifically written to include at least one spiral groove within the uniform diameter encompassing the longitudinal axis of the bristle.

Accordingly, the application will be amended as follows: